



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1963 No. 148

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 121: 2: *My help comes from the Lord.*

O Thou whose resources of grace are inexhaustible and abundantly adequate, we humbly acknowledge that we greatly need Thy divine guidance to carry on victoriously in the many strange and various events and experiences of each new day.

Hitherto Thou hast blessed us and we are commending and committing ourselves to Thy care and keeping as we face a future which we cannot foresee or foretell.

Grant that through the old and familiar way of prayer we may receive wisdom and strength to accept the challenge of every difficult task and every noble adventure.

Give us a clear and commanding vision of the glory and splendor of a social order dedicated and devoted to the principles of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE GESELL REPORT

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished Congressman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] introduced a bill which, if enacted into law, would nullify the directive issued by the Department of Defense on July 26, 1963, that seeks to implement major portions of the Gesell report.

As we are well aware, this report has not been widely publicized as it should have been, and, in my opinion, its implementation could be one of the most dangerous steps this Nation has ever taken with regard to the military.

I do not speak about integration or segregation, I speak as forcefully as I may about the proper role of the military, and that role is to defend this Nation, under the control of its civilian officials.

I agree entirely with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that it would be a serious mistake for the armed services to be forced into becoming active exponents of social reform.

The implementation of the Gesell report would accomplish little, in my opinion, and its dangers are many. It would almost force members of our Armed Forces into local politics, State politics, and Federal politics—it would place politics into the promotion of our officers, rather than on the basis of their ability to defend this Nation and command its armed services.

The bill of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] seeks to keep the military in the business of defending this Nation. That is their proper role, it has been their role, and should continue to be their role; and, no matter how anyone may feel, the military should not be made the vehicle for social action.

The Gesell report is a dangerous document. It is a new and unwarranted intrusion for the military into the civilian life, and I would warn this Nation that this is dangerous.

The recommendations of the Gesell Committee would subordinate the defense of this Nation to a social program, for the military to actively interfere with the social life of this Nation in the guise of social reform, it would have officers graded on the basis of their ability to bring about such social changes on and off base rather than on their ability and courage and leadership in defending this Nation.

There are other phases of this report which I feel all Americans should be warned about, it is a dangerous philosophy. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in having introduced this bill which would nullify the directive of the Department of Defense and thereby prevent our military from embarking on an unwise, unsound, and dangerous course of action. I urge

its passage. Let the military retain its proper role, that of defending this Nation.

FEDERAL TAX REDUCTION AND REFORM BILL

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, next week I shall vote for the tax bill.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to what can be referred to as a "fringe benefit" contained in the tax reduction and reform bill we shall be considering within another week.

The stimulus to the economy on the national level will have its counterpart on the State and local governmental levels as well. It is now estimated tax revenue in this sector of government will be increased 7 percent if the proposed Federal tax bill is enacted.

In my State of Indiana this can be estimated to be in excess of \$64 million with a breakdown showing State government can expect a boost in revenue by \$29 million and local governments can benefit by some \$35 million. A sizable portion of State revenue is reallocated to local units which should further ease a property tax burden that is approaching the confiscatory level in some cases.

It is a "fringe benefit" which can further stimulate the economy in the areas of immediate concern to all Members of this House.

SECTION 301 OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of time, we have been able to see in specific form the defects that some of us pointed out in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 at the time of its passage.

At that time, I indicated the radical change that was projected in the then

16431

existing procedure for obtaining redress by industries affected by tariff cuts and resulting imports.

The legislation set up a new philosophy whereby industries were no longer protected against the flow of imports, but were to be allowed to suffer and decline with the novel provision, however, that nationally financed assistance should be forthcoming to the industries and workers who suffered through the expanded volume of imports.

Even under the new philosophy of trade introduced by the 1962 legislation, the provisions of the act have proven to be too restrictive. While I should have preferred to retain the old escape clause philosophy, nevertheless, given the new law, I can see the necessity of the "adjustment assistance" provisions of section 301 of that act.

Unfortunately, experience shows that the law is so rigid that the Tariff Commission has been unable to apply it.

According to a recent report, the Commission has completed 11 investigations under section 301. In all cases, the Commission unanimously found no basis for qualifying the petitioner for assistance under the act.

The principal reason for this Commission finding has been the requirement of the law that the Commission determine that increased imports shall be a major cause of injury or threat of injury to the petitioner.

This requirement contrasts with the requirement under a comparable section of the old law, which permitted the Commission to make a finding of injury when increased imports contributed substantially to causing or threatening serious injury to a petitioning industry.

I feel that neither the sponsors of the bill, nor Congress, intended to provide a requirement which would be as exclusionary as section 301 has proved to be. In my judgment, it does not meet the objectives of the legislation. Accordingly, I have prepared and filed a bill to amend section 301 of the Trade Expansion Act to substitute for major cause the phrase substantial factor in causing. This will permit action by the Commission in its discretion where imports have been a substantial cause of injury, but will not make it mandatory that the Commission find such injury only when at least 51 percent of the cause shall have been the imports.

If some such reasonable standard is not provided, the remedial sections of the new law will never be made effective and there will be no remedy for the inevitable loss from increased imports.

DEPLORABLE PHILOSOPHY OF THE NEWS MEDIA

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, it has depressed me to read in recent days the headlines in our news media speculating on the possible death of a former Member of this House and a beloved friend of mine and I know of every Member

of this House when he served in this body. I am referring to our former colleague, CLAIR ENGLE, of California. CLAIR ENGLE and I became very fast friends when I came to Congress in 1952. It would seem to me that the years he served in this House and in the other body would impel the press of this country and the other news media to ask our people to pray for his speedy recovery rather than writing headlines and news columns in speculation on who might take his place in the event of his death.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this, and I should hope there will be a change in the philosophy of the news media, so that they will think more about the recovery of this very fine person, a respected friend and former colleague of ours, than to speculate about his possible death.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making. I think they are very timely under the circumstances.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the approval of the distinguished majority leader. I hope that this change will be brought about all over this Nation. I think what has been done is deplorable. I do not think any Member of this House approves it. I do not believe that any politician in the country likes this type of newspaper speculation while a man has any hope of recovery. I pray and shall pray every day for his recovery.

PRAYERS IN SCHOOL

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me has been a dedicated crusader as a result of the prayer decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. In connection with that crusade I received a letter in the mail this morning that I think is meaningful and quite moving. I shall not reveal the names of the authors other than to say that they are three young school-age ladies. I read this letter for the benefit of the House. It is dated September 14, 1963, from Hilliard, Ohio. It says:

Dear CONGRESSMAN: We are writing for our family and friends. We feel that the Supreme Court should rule in prayers because our country is based on religion and the freedom of speech.

Some schools are still having prayers, but our school isn't. What do you think we should do? If our school voted democratically on having prayers, and we voted in the affirmative, could we have the right?

We sincerely hope this letter can help you in fighting for our rights, and we would really appreciate an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have come to a sorry pass when the youngsters of our country have to write to their Congressmen and ask if they could democratically vote to save prayers in the schools.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 138, the RECORD indicates that I did not vote. I was present that day as the RECORD will indicate and voted on other issues that were before the House. I was present at that time and voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RESIDUAL OIL—THE COAL LOBBY STEPS BACKWARD AGAIN

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. BATTIN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a lengthy communication from Mr. Joseph Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference. The conference, as many of us know, is the well-financed, well-organized lobby of the domestic coal industry. As many of us in New England know all too well, the conference has spearheaded the drive to continue the rigid, costly, and discriminatory quotas on imports of residual oil which put our economy at a grossly unfair competitive disadvantage.

Mr. Moody's latest appeal urges the Congress to eliminate the Atomic Energy Commission's development program designed to stimulate the nuclear powered utility industry. The Federal Government, Mr. Moody complains, is "developing nuclear power to compete with coal." Mr. Moody asks us to "oppose any further appropriations to provide subsidies for the nuclear reactor development program." He also invites comment and I am glad to comply with this request.

COAL OPPOSES PROGRESS

There are Members of Congress better qualified than I to discuss the merits of the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear power development program and who can speak to the overall wisdom of Mr. Moody's criticisms. However, I have always looked upon the development of atomic energy as a promising national venture. I look forward to the day when nuclear energy may realize its full potential and may be harnessed for peaceful purposes to dramatically improve the living standards of our people and, indeed, all the world. The atoms for peace program advanced by former President Eisenhower holds great promise of progress for all mankind.

But, regrettably, once again, Mr. Moody seeks to turn back the clock. Wholly apart from any consideration of the merits of Mr. Moody's observations on the development of atomic power, I am struck by the fact that the coal industry, as Mr. Moody puts it, is now unalterably opposed to Government subsidies to a competitive source of energy which may, he fears, discriminate against the coal industry. Mr. Moody, it seems to